

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8, and 10-15 are now pending in the application. Claim 1 is now amended. Claim 9 is now cancelled. Claim 15 is now added. The claim amendments and new claim are fully supported by the application as filed and do not present new subject matter. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW

Applicants' representative, Brent G. Seitz, thanks Examiner Joyce for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview of June 14, 2007. During the interview, differences between the cited art and the claims as set forth herein, including new Claim 15, were discussed. No agreements were reached.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9, 13, and 14 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for recognizing the allowable subject matter of these claims.

Accordingly, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 9. Therefore, Claim 1 and those claims dependent therefrom are now in a condition for allowance.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 6, 8, and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alschweig (DE 100 51 707) in view of Torii et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,115,690).

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alschweig (DE 100 51 707) and Torii et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,115,690), and further in view of Ward (U.S. Pat. No. 6,623,169).

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alschweig (DE 100 51 707) and Torii et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,115,690), and further in view of Sheehan et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0042424).

As set forth above, Claim 1 is now amended to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 9. Therefore, dependent Claims 2-6, 8, and 10-12 are also in a condition for allowance at least for including the allowable subject matter of Claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 103 rejection of Claim 1 and those claims dependent therefrom.

NEW CLAIM 15

Applicants now add new Claim 15. Claim 15 is fully supported by the Application as filed. For example, Claim 15 recites “at least one cantilever arm, fastenable to this column at any desired height.” Support for this feature is found throughout the application as filed, such as at page 8, 3rd paragraph. Claim 15 recites “the at least one cantilever arm being fastened solely to the column in a fixed position.” Support for this feature is found throughout the application as filed, such as at original Claim 2. Applicants respectfully request entry and consideration of new Claim 15.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 20, 2007

By:

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Brent G. Seitz
Reg. No. 54,435

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BGS/cn